

Washington State Court Improvement Program 2019 Annual Self-Assessment Report

This self-assessment is intended as an opportunity for Court Improvement Programs (CIPs) to review progress on required CIP projects, joint program planning and improvement efforts with the child welfare agency, and ability to integrate CQI successfully into practice. Questions are designed to solicit candid responses that help CIPs apply CQI and identify support that may be helpful.

I. CQI Analyses of Required CIP Projects (Joint Project with Agency and Hearing Quality Project)

Joint Project with the Child Welfare Agency:

Provide a concise description of the joint project selected in your jurisdiction.

Permanency Summits. Using the criteria of counties with longest length of stay of children in out of home care that lack system improvement resources, such as state Family and Juvenile Court Improvement Program (FJCIP) grants and Court Improvement Training Academy (CITA) Tables of Ten stakeholder groups, the Permanency CQI Workgroup determines which counties to focus on. Judicial officers and Department of Children, Youth and Families (DCYF) local management provided leadership and the workgroup co-chairs facilitate discussions with the local stakeholder group to share information and plan for a permanency summit. The summit day includes a data presentation, roles and responsibilities presentation, presentations on identified barriers to permanency, all of which include parent and child voices. The day also includes a team building activity, identifying priorities, and individual and group action planning. The goal is to provide two to three summits per year, depending on available resources.

Identify the specific safety, permanency, or well-being outcome this project is intended to address.

Decrease time to permanency.

Approximate date that the project began:

March 2016

Which stage of the CQI process best describes the current status of project work?

Phase V: Evaluate and Apply Findings

How was the need for this project identified? (Phase I)

In May of 2015, the Permanency CQI Workgroup was formed with the Children's Administration and CIP Director co-chairing the effort. The workgroup consists of representatives of the judiciary, tribes, parent attorneys, child attorneys, agency attorneys, CASAs, Casey Family Program, the Court Improvement Training Academy (CITA) and several high-level staff from Children's Administration. The goal of the group was to increase the number of children achieving timely reunification/permanency. The workgroup met monthly to review data provided by Children's Administration (CA) and the courts. The focus of the review was on length of stay for children in out of home care. To focus improvement efforts, information was gathered regarding child welfare stakeholders in areas that had high length of stay as well as low length of stay, to identify commonalities and differences. Through this process, an increase in social worker turnover was observed and root causes were explored. The workgroup identified a need for child welfare system professionals to gather in a forum outside of the courtroom setting to develop an understanding of each other's roles in the child welfare process. The workgroup also wanted to provide an opportunity for local stakeholders to address system issues, share ideas for system improvement, and inspire and build champions for permanency.

What is the theory of change for the project? (Phase II)

If we bring together child welfare stakeholders in a community and show them their data, allow them to make meaning of the data, and provide resources to host a permanency summit addressing issues they find relevant, they will make an action plan and create champions for permanency at a local level, which will ultimately decrease lengths of stay for that jurisdiction.

Have you identified a solution/intervention that you will implement? If yes, what is it? (Phase III)

Using the process described above, we plan on providing two to three permanency summits per year. We also discovered a need to provide resources for the FJCIP counties to hold permanency summits (up to five FJCIP permanency summits per year).

What has been done to implement the project? (Phase IV)

Following the protocols listed above, permanency summits have been held in Clark/Cowlitz Counties in September 2016; Grant County in May 2017; Benton/Franklin Counties in

September 2017; Okanogan County in July 2018, and Kittitas County in October 2018. For the FJCIP counties, the Court Improvement Training Academy worked with the FJCIP coordinators to plan and facilitate five permanency summits, which were held between June and September 2018 for King, Chelan, Clallam/Jefferson, and Snohomish Counties. Planning efforts are underway to hold Permanency Summits in the following six FJCIP counties in 2019: Island, King, Kitsap, Pierce, Spokane, and Thurston. Information from the 2018 Child and Family Services Review will be incorporated into the data that will be shared for these events.

What is being done or how do you intend to monitor the progress of the project? (Phase V)

A follow-up meeting with the local planning committee is held to discuss whether the permanency summit provided the desired outcome for the local stakeholders. A tracking mechanism was developed for following up on each county's action plans. Data will be collected comparing length of stay before and after the permanency summits. The newly formed Innovative Dependency Court Collaborative will continue to monitor the progress of the counties that host the permanency summits.

What assistance or support would be helpful from the CBCC or Children's Bureau to help move the project forward?

No assistance needed at this time, other than funding for evaluations.

Hearing Quality Project:

Provide a concise description of the joint project selected in your jurisdiction.

Facilitate local cross-system stakeholder meetings and trainings to develop community-specific plans for implementing the revised parent-child visitation policy in order to improve the quality of court hearings regarding visitation.

Approximate date that the project began:

November 2016

Which stage of the CQI process best describes the current status of project work?

Phase IV: Plan, Prepare, and Implement

How was the need for this project identified?

The Court Improvement Program sponsored a Region 10 (Alaska, Idaho, Oregon and Washington) Parent Representation Leadership Forum in November 2016. The forum was convened to improve parent representation and focused on visitation, the Indian Child Welfare Act, and serving parents in rural areas. Each state worked with their stakeholder teams to create an action plan. Washington State determined that, while an improved visitation policy was recently enacted, most dependency court partners are not aware of the new provisions, nor are they implementing the revised visitation policy. It was determined that education and focused work needs to happen at the local level to ensure implementation of the revised visitation policy. The education and local improvement plans should facilitate a more meaningful discussion of parent-child visitation before and during hearings. Judicial officers will be better prepared to ask the right questions during hearings, understanding the requirements of the revised policy, and litigants will be better prepared to answer. By putting these elements in place, it is more likely that a quality court hearing or review will occur, protecting the rights and safety of children and parents to spend quality time together. Higher quality legal representation should result from working with the Department of Children, Youth, and Families (DCYF) and the court to improve visitation planning and implementation.

What is the theory of change for the project?

If local cross-system stakeholder meetings and trainings are held to identify local barriers to effective visitation and develop community-specific plans for implementing the revised parent-child visitation policy, it will improve the quality of court hearings and reviews regarding visitation, which is a key contributor to faster, lasting reunification.

Have you identified a solution/intervention that you will implement? If yes, what is it?

The identified solution is to facilitate parent-child visitation forums at a local level to provide training on the revised visitation policy, using safety guidelines to address visit supervision, practice decision making skills using scenarios in multidisciplinary groups, and discuss community needs and available resources.

What has been done to implement the project?

A planning group consisting of key staff from DCYF, Office of Public Defense, Attorney General's Office, CITA, and the Court Improvement Program developed the curriculum for the all-day forum. The curriculum covers the following topics:

- The harm of removal – review of research on the importance of attachment, bonding and relationships to healthy child development and how separation from parents and family members can negatively impact children.

- The experience of visiting from the perspective of children and parents who were involved in child welfare.
- DCYF visitation data regarding frequency, duration and levels of supervision for the specific community undergoing training.
- Overview of DCYF visitation policy.
- Child Safety Framework – overview of safety planning components of the American Bar Association (ABA) Child Safety Guide structure for discussing child safety and creating safety plans for visitation.
- Opportunities to apply learning through scenarios and interactive exercises.

Between November 2017 and May 2018, parent-child visitation forums were held in Grays Harbor, Thurston/Mason, Whatcom/Skagit and Grant counties. A similar training was provided in Island County to the Table of Ten court improvement partnership. Each audience was encouraged to identify local plans to improve visitation practice. Counties with active Tables of Ten also utilized these structures to develop and implement visitation projects.

Since the original visitation forums were held, several counties have requested more comprehensive training on the ABA Child Safety Guide framework to develop common language and understanding in order for the court to address safety at all points in a dependency case. This has resulted in a culture shift in some courts, where safety inquiries are routinely included in discussions of visitation, safety planning, and case planning. In 2019, comprehensive ABA Child Safety Guide training was provided to judicial officers attending CITA's annual dependency judicial officer training.

The visitation forums were provided in a collaborative effort to implement a new DCYF pilot project to contract with a certain number of visitation providers for supported visits.

What is being done or how do you intend to monitor the progress of the project?

DCYF visitation data is periodically pulled and compared to the baseline data to assess participating communities' progress in moving visitation from overwhelmingly supervised and time restricted to include more monitored/unsupervised visits with a wider range of frequency and duration. The data provides information to assess whether local visitation practice has improved, and if it meets the intent of the revised policy, including the requirement that visits are to be unsupervised unless present danger, risk or safety concerns exist.

For example, one year after the visitation forum in Mason County supervised visits decreased from 86% to 38%, monitored visits increased from 7% to 53%, and unsupervised visits increased from 7% to 9%. In Thurston County supervised visits decreased from 83% to 49%, monitored visits increased from 11% to 40%, and unsupervised visits increased from 6% to 11%.

In addition, pre and post surveys were developed for forum participants to gauge their knowledge of the new policy and the local culture of visitation. This data has been reported to the local stakeholder groups, statewide stakeholder leaders, CIP Steering Committee, and Permanency CQI Workgroup.

In late 2019, we plan to begin tracking in-court safety framework discussions in courts that have participated in visitation forums and safety guide trainings. The data will be collected by OPD supervising attorneys who already routinely observe and code the content of court hearings.

What assistance or support would be helpful from the CBCC or Children's Bureau to help move the project forward?

No assistance needed at this time.

II. Trainings, Projects, and Activities For questions 1-9, provide a **concise** description of work completed or underway to date in FY 2019 (October 2018-June 2019) in the below topical subcategories.

For question 1, focus on significant training events or initiatives held or developed in FY 2019 and answer the corresponding questions.

1. Trainings

<i>Topical Area</i>	<i>Did you hold or develop a training on this topic?</i>	<i>Who was the target audience?</i>	<i>How many persons attended?</i>	<i>What type of training is it? (e.g., conference, training curriculum/program, webinar)</i>	<i>What were the intended training outcomes?</i>	<i>What type of training evaluation did you do? S=Satisfaction, L=Learning, B=Behavior, O=Outcomes</i>
Data	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Dependency Court Partners in Spokane County	15	One-hour training	Improved use of the interactive dependency timeliness report for tracking purposes and stakeholder meetings.	<input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> L <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> O <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Hearing quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	See Dependency Court Practice Below				<input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> L <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> O <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Improving timeliness/permanency	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Judicial officers, attorneys, CASAs, social workers	328	6 one-day Permanency Summits	Create champions for permanency in order to reduce time to permanency	<input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> L <input type="checkbox"/> B <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> O <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

<i>Topical Area</i>	<i>Did you hold or develop a training on this topic?</i>	<i>Who was the target audience?</i>	<i>How many persons attended?</i>	<i>What type of training is it? (e.g., conference, training curriculum/program, webinar)</i>	<i>What were the intended training outcomes?</i>	<i>What type of training evaluation did you do? S=Satisfaction, L=Learning, B=Behavior, O=Outcomes</i>
Quality legal representation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Attorneys for children	65	2 two-day training curriculum programs	Improve race equity awareness, trauma informed child interviewing, college supports for foster youth, knowledge regarding Quality Residential Treatment Program (QRTP) implementation, and establish a learning community.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> L <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> O <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Engagement & participation of parties	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	See Dependency Court Practice and Children's Justice Conference Below				<input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> L <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> O <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Well-being	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	See Dependency Court Practice and Children's Justice Conference Below				<input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> L <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> O <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
ICWA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	See Dependency Court Practice and Children's Justice Conference Below				<input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> L <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> O <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Sex Trafficking	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	See Children's Justice Conference Below				<input type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> L <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> O <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

<i>Topical Area</i>	<i>Did you hold or develop a training on this topic?</i>	<i>Who was the target audience?</i>	<i>How many persons attended?</i>	<i>What type of training is it? (e.g., conference, training curriculum/program, webinar)</i>	<i>What were the intended training outcomes?</i>	<i>What type of training evaluation did you do? S=Satisfaction, L=Learning, B=Behavior, O=Outcomes</i>
Other: Dependency Court Practice for Judicial Officers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Judicial officers and FJCIP Coordinators	32	3-day Training Curriculum Program	Basic Dependency training on all areas listed above, plus judicial leadership and ABA safety guide training.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> L <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> O <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Children's Justice Conference	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Multidisciplinary	CIP sponsored 30 judges 8 FJCIP Coord. Over 1,300 multi-disciplines attended	2-day Conference	Broad range of dependency topics including legal track	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S <input type="checkbox"/> L <input type="checkbox"/> B <input type="checkbox"/> O <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

On average, with ordinary funding levels, how many training events do you hold per year? 10

What is your best prediction for the number of attorneys and judges that attend a training annually? 550

The Family First Prevention Services Act amends the Social Security Act adding an eligibility criterion for the training of judges and attorneys on the congregate care provisions of the Act. See the highlighted portion below.

(1)¹ IN GENERAL.— In order to be eligible to receive a grant under this section, a highest State court shall have in effect a rule requiring State courts to ensure that foster parents, pre- adoptive parents, and relative caregivers of a child in foster care under the responsibility of the State are notified of any proceeding to be held with respect to the child, shall provide for the training of judges, attorneys, and other legal personnel in child welfare cases on Federal child welfare policies and payment limitations with respect to children in foster care who are placed in settings that are not a foster family home, and shall submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such form, and including such information and assurances as the Secretary may require, including—

States have an option to delay implementation of the congregate care provisions by two years. The decision will have a direct impact on when judicial determinations and CIP training requirements must begin.

Do you know when your state plans to implement Family First? Yes No

If yes, when?

October 1, 2019

Have you been involved in planning with the agency on implementing Family First? Yes No

If yes, please describe how the CIP has been involved.

The CIP Director participated in a multidisciplinary stakeholder meeting on December 18, 2018, webinar on January 8, 2019, and has been tracking the agency FFPSA website for updates. The CIP Director and the Child Welfare Programs Division Director have been in communication regarding FFPSA implementation and have included FFPSA in the work plan for the CIP multidisciplinary task force, the Innovative Dependency Court Collaborative. The CIP Director is overseeing the courts' implementation of agency requested Washington State House Bill 1900 regarding FFPSA, which includes changes to statutes regarding the court's oversight of quality residential treatment placement (QRTP). Implementation will include changes in pattern forms for dependency hearings.

Have you been developing your Family First judicial training plan? Yes No

If yes, please describe what you have done.

¹ Sec. 50741(c) of P.L. 115-123 revised sec. 438(b)(1) to add language regarding training. Effective as if enacted on 1/1/18 (sec. 50746(a)(1) of P.L. 115-123).

In November 2018, the CIP Director included an introduction to FFPSA in the monthly Dependency Practice Tip, which was sent to all superior court judicial officers and administrators; and to our court partners—attorneys, CASAs, and child welfare agency. The Dependency Court Practice for Judicial Officers training held in March 2019, included a session on FFPSA and QRTP. The CIP Director and CITA staff scheduled a meeting in June 2019, with the Child Welfare Programs Division Director and the new Family First Administrator to discuss our information needs for developing the training curriculum for judges, attorneys and other legal personnel in child welfare cases. We are planning on holding a statewide, multidisciplinary gathering that will include the QRTP training. We also plan on developing an online training. We will request a session regarding FFPSA at the Superior Court Judges’ Association Spring Conference in April 2020, to review QRTP training and obtain feedback for improving the process, as it will be six months post FFPSA implementation. We will also include a session on FFPSA/QRTP at the Children’s Justice Conference to be held in May 2020.

2. **Data Projects.** *Data projects include any work with administrative data sets (e.g, AFCARS, SACWIS), data dashboards, data reports, fostering court improvement data, case management systems, and data sharing efforts.*

Do you have a data project/activity? Yes No (skip to #3)

Project Description	How would you categorize this project?	Work Stage (if applicable)
WA Dependency Data Share Efforts - Child data is extracted from the DCYF FAMLINK data system. This data is then used to match back to WA Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) case file data.	Agency Data Sharing Efforts	Evaluation/Assessment
WA Annual Dependency Timeliness Report to the Legislature – Provides annual analyses of dependency court operations with respect to statutorily mandated timelines. Click here to find the 2018 Annual Report.	Case management systems	Evaluation/Assessment
WA Dependency Data Dashboards/Reports - Interactive reports use Microsoft Excel pivot tables that allow the user to view state and individual county data for broad comparisons or person/case-specific information. A public facing Dependency Dashboard was created in November 2017 using Tableau software. The dashboard is updated monthly with court data and quarterly with agency data. Click here to access the new dashboard.	Data dashboards	Evaluation/Assessment

(a) Do you have data reports that you consistently view? Yes No

(b) How are these reports used to support your work?

Reports are used to assist in determining which jurisdictions may need some assistance in focusing their efforts on certain aspects of their dependency practice, as well as observing jurisdictions with high performance measures to determine what is working well that may be shared with others. Reports are shared with child welfare stakeholders.

3. **Hearing Quality.** *Hearing quality projects include any efforts you have made to improve the quality of dependency hearings, including court observation/assessment projects, process improvements, specialty/pilot court projects, projects related to court orders or title IV-E determinations, mediation, or appeals.*

Do you have a hearing quality project/activity? Yes No (skip to #4)

Project Description	How would you categorize this project?	Work Stage (if applicable)
Facilitate parent-child visitation forums at a local level to provide training on the revised visitation policy, using safety guidelines to address visit supervision, practice decision making skills using scenarios in multidisciplinary groups, and discuss community needs and available resources in order to improve the quality of court hearings regarding visitation.	Process Improvements	Implementation
	Choose an item.	Choose an item.
	Choose an item.	Choose an item.

4. Improving Timeliness of Hearings or Permanency Outcomes. *Timeliness and permanency projects include any activities or projects meant to improve the timeliness of case processing or achievement of timely permanency. This could include general timeliness, focus on continuances or appeals, working on permanency goals other than APPLA, or focus on APPLA and older youth.*

Do you have a Timeliness or permanency project/activity? Yes No (skip to #5)

Project Description	How would you categorize this project?	Work Stage (if applicable)
Local Permanency Summits designed to increase collaboration among dependency court partners, review data, identify barriers to permanency, and create action plans.	General/ASFA	Evaluation/Assessment
	Choose an item.	Choose an item.
	Choose an item.	Choose an item.

5. Quality of Legal Representation. *Quality of legal representation projects may include any activities/efforts related to improvement of representation for parents, youth, or the agency. This might include assessments or analyzing current practice, implementing new practice models, working with law school clinics, or other activities in this area.*

Do you have a quality legal representation project/activity? Yes No (skip to #6)

Project Description	How would you categorize this project?	Work Stage (if applicable)
CIP working with DCYF, OPD and OCLA to implement IV-E reimbursement for expenses related to parent and child representation.	Other	Selecting Solution
	Choose an item.	Choose an item.
	Choose an item.	Choose an item.

6. Engagement & Participation of Parties. *Engagement and participation of parties includes any efforts centered around youth, parent, foster family, or caregiver engagement, as well as projects related to notice to relatives, limited English proficiency, or other efforts to increase presence and engagement at the hearing.*

Do you have an engagement or participation of parties project/activity? Yes No

Project Description	How would you categorize this project?	Work Stage (if applicable)
Supporting Parents for Parents (P4P) program implementation in two new counties.	Parent Engagement	Implementation
Assisting with professional evaluation of the P4P program.	Parent Engagement	Evaluation/Assessment
Continuing to monitor data and educate attorneys and clerks to document whether adequate notice was provided for caregivers and if a caregiver report was provided to the court.	Caregiver Engagement	Evaluation/Assessment

7. Well-Being. *Well-being projects include any efforts related to improving the well-being of youth. Projects could focus on education, early childhood development, psychotropic medication, LGBTQ youth, trauma, racial disproportionality/disparity, immigration, or other well-being related topics.*

Do you have any projects/activities focused on well-being? Yes No (skip to #8)

Project Description	How would you categorize this project?	Work Stage (if applicable)
Annual Youth Leadership Summit – Proposals addressing all topics listed above presented by the youth to the Commission on Children in Foster Care, legislators and other stakeholders.	Other	Evaluation/Assessment

Project Description	How would you categorize this project?	Work Stage (if applicable)
	Choose an item.	Choose an item.
	Choose an item.	Choose an item.

8. **ICWA.** *ICWA projects could include any efforts to enhance state and tribal collaboration, state and tribal court agreements, data collection and analysis of ICWA compliance, or ICWA notice projects.*

Do you have any projects/activities focused on ICWA? Yes No (skip to #9)

Project Description	How would you categorize this project?	Work Stage (if applicable)
Began discussion with DCYF regarding court requirements section of the 2015 Indian Child Welfare Case Review to perform root cause analysis and develop an action plan for courts. New case review to occur in 2019.	Other	Planning
	Choose an item.	Choose an item.
	Choose an item.	Choose an item.

9. **Preventing Sex Trafficking and Strengthening Families Act (PSTFSA).** *PSTFSA projects could include any work around domestic child sex trafficking, the reasonable and prudent parent standard, a focus on runaway youth, focus on normalcy, collaboration with other agencies around this topic, data collection and analysis, data sharing, or other efforts to fully implement the act into practice.*

Do you have any projects/activities focused on PSTSFA? Yes No

Project Description	How would you categorize this project?	Work Stage (if applicable)
Updated Non-offender Juvenile Bench Book to include a chapter on child sex trafficking.	Sex Trafficking	Implementation
	Choose an item.	Choose an item.
	Choose an item.	Choose an item.

III. CIP Collaboration in Child Welfare Program Planning and Improvement Efforts

1. *Please describe how the CIP was involved with the state's CFSP due June 30, 2019.*

a. *Does the CFSP include any of the following:*

legal/judicial strategies *the CIP/Agency Joint Project* *the CIP Hearing Quality Project*

If yes, please describe.

The CFSP includes our two main CIP projects: the joint project regarding permanency summits, and the hearing quality project regarding family time. The agency plan also includes partnering through the Innovative Dependency Court Collaborative, which is our CIP multidisciplinary task force. Some of our other initiatives that are included in the CFSP are: multidisciplinary trainings to increase staff knowledge, skills and improve practice; developing a common language and practice identified across child welfare systems, improving ICWA compliance, and supporting the Parents for Parents program

2. *Please describe how the CIP was or will be involved in the most recent/upcoming title IV-E Foster Care Eligibility Review in your state.*

CIP was informed of progress through the Permanency CQI Workgroup meetings. CIP participated in the interview process and also assisted with making connections with judicial officers to be interviewed. CIP was involved in PIP planning and worked with CFSR staff from DCYF to use our Permanency CQI Workgroup to perform some root cause analysis on our low permanency numbers and draft some solutions/action plans. Also, CIP connected DCYF CFSR staff with the FJCIP stakeholder groups to review the CFSR findings at a local level and perform root cause analysis and created possible solutions. CIP worked with lead DCYF CFSR staff before, during and after the State Team meetings to make sure court initiatives were included in the PIP.

3. *Please describe how the CIP is or was involved in preparing and completing round 3 of the CFSR and PIP, if required, in your state. Please check all the ways that the CIP or Court Personnel were involved (or plan to be involved) in the CFSR and PIP Process. Feel free to add additional narrative to explain your involvement in the process.*

- were not involved at all
- were involved in planning the statewide assessment
- were CFSR reviewers
- were interviewed for CFSR
- were invited to the exit conference at the close of the CFSR review
- were invited to the final CFSR results session at the conclusion of the report
- Final CFSR report was shared with you

- Final CFSR report shared with courts broadly across the state
- were a part of a large group of stakeholders engaged to assist in design of the PIP
- high level of inclusion during the entire PIP process
- made suggestions for inclusion in the PIP
- suggestions made by CIP for inclusion in the PIP were put forward by the child welfare agency
- had an opportunity to review and provide feedback on the PIP before it was submitted
- meet (or plan to meet) ongoing with the child welfare agency to monitor PIP Implementation

The current version of the PIP includes (check all that apply):

- court strategies court/agency shared strategies
- the court/agency joint project described above the CIP hearing quality project
- specific practice changes that judges will make
- specific practice changes that attorneys will make

4. *What strategies or processes are in place in your state that you feel are particularly effective in supporting joint child welfare program planning and improvement?*

The CIP Director, CITA staff, and other court partners are now invited on a regular basis to participate in the DCYF QA/CQI Statewide Team, Family Time Workgroup, and Permanency from Day One Grant meetings. In addition, the creation of the Innovative Dependency Court Collaborative, co-chaired by the CIP Director and Child Welfare Director, with a very diverse multi-disciplinary membership, to encourage, generate and support innovation with dependency court stakeholders and communities to empower and achieve justice for families. We are focusing our efforts in the field, rather than from a top-down approach.

5. *What barriers exist in your state that make effective joint child welfare program planning and improvement challenging?*

Lack of communication between the agency and court partners. However, the strategies listed above should improve communication, which will also improve planning and implementation of improvement efforts. Another barrier is limited staff resources necessary for follow up and ability to reach and work with all local jurisdictions on improving their dependency system. We get stretched too thin and have difficulty with follow up.

6. *Does the state child welfare agency currently offer professional partner training to judges, attorneys, and court personnel as part of its Title IV-E Training Plan? If yes, please provide a brief description of what is provided and how.*

If no, have you met with child welfare agency leadership to discuss and explore utilizing professional partner training for judges, attorneys and court personnel?

Yes and No. CASA training is included in the Title IV-E Training Plan and DCYF has a contract with CASA to reimburse training expenses. Several judicial officers attend the annual CASA training conference. We are exploring options to expand beyond CASA training and incorporate more holistic, multidisciplinary trainings into the Title IV-E Training Plan that include judicial officers, attorneys and court personnel to support initiatives addressed in the PIP and CFSP.

7. *Have you talked with your agency about accessing Title IV-E funding for legal representation for parents or for children? Is the agency planning to seek reimbursement? If yes, describe any plans, approaches, or models that are under consideration or underway.*

Yes. In January 2019, the CIP Director facilitated a meeting with the DCYF Budget Director, Office of Public Defense Director (parent representation program), and Office of Civil Legal Aid (child representation program), and the Co-Chair of the CIP Steering Committee, to talk about funding for legal representation for parents and children. The DCYF Budget Director brought the issue to DCYF leadership for their approval to move forward. DCYF is currently in contract negotiations with OPD and OCLA to pass through funding. DCYF will submit an amendment to their cost allocation plan in order to claim the IV-E funding.

IV. CQI Current Capacity Assessment

1. *Has your ability to integrate CQI into practice changed this year? If yes, what do you attribute the increase in ability to?*

Yes. As we work more closely with the agency and are tied more directly with their CQI staff, we are integrating CQI into more of the work that we do—more stakeholder work on issues, including root cause analysis and theory of change.

2. *Which of the following CBCC Events/Services have you/your staff engaged in in the 2019 Fiscal Year?*

- Designing & Evaluating Effective Trainings Workshop
- CQI Consult (*Topic:* _____)
- Constituency Group- Hearing Quality
- Constituency Group- CFSR
- Constituency Group – ICWA
- Constituency Group – New Directors
- Constituency Group- Safety Decision Making
- Constituency Group- Quality Legal Rep
- Constituency Group – Anti-Trafficking
- Constituency Group – APPLA/Older Youth

CIP All Call — *What % of All Calls does your CIP participate in?* 92 %

3. *Do you have any of the following resources to help you integrate CQI into practice?*

CIP staff with CQI (e.g., data, evaluation) expertise Consultants with CQI expertise

a University partnership A statewide court case management system

Contracts with external individuals or organizations to assist with CQI efforts

Other resources: _____

3a. *Do you record your child welfare court hearings?* Yes No

If yes, are they audio video

3b. *Can you remotely access your court case management system? For example, Odyssey systems often allow remote access to case files.* Yes No

4. *Consider the phases of change management and how you integrate these into practice. Are there phases of the process (e.g., Phase I-need assessment, Phase II-theory of change) that you struggle with integrating more than others?*

Assessments and evaluations.

5. *Is there a topic or practice area that you would find useful from the Capacity Building Center for Courts? Be as specific as possible (e.g., data analysis, how to evaluate trainings, more information on research about quality legal representation, how to facilitate group meetings, etc.)*

More information and practice on how to incorporate project evaluation into the planning process and best practices for evaluating different types of projects.

Self-Assessment – Capacity Continued

We would like you to assess your current capacities related to knowledge, skills, resources, and collaboration by responding to the following 2 sets of questions. In questions 6 and 7, we ask about CQI. When we say CQI we mean the entire change management process including root cause analysis, theory of change, strategy selection, implementation and evaluation.

6. Please indicate your level of agreement to the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I have a good understanding of CQI.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I understand how to integrate CQI into all our work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I am familiar with the available data relevant to our work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I understand how to interpret and apply the available data.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The CIP and the state child welfare agency have shared goals.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The CIP and the state child welfare agency collaborate around program planning and improvement efforts.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
We have the resources we need to fully integrate CQI into practice.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have staff, consultants, or partners who can answer my CQI questions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

7. How frequently do you engage in the following activities?

	<i>Never</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Often</i>	<i>Always</i>
We use data to make decisions about where to focus our efforts.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
We meet with representatives of the child welfare agency to engage in collaborative systems change efforts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
We create theories of change around systems change projects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
We use evaluation/assessment findings to make changes to programs/practices.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
We evaluate (beyond monitoring outputs) our efforts.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

APPENDIX A: DEFINITIONS

Definitions of Evidence

Evidence-based practice – evidence-based practices are practice that have been empirically tested in a rigorous way (involving random assignment to groups), have demonstrated effectiveness related to specific outcomes, have been replicated in practice at least one, and have findings published in peer reviewed journal articles.

Empirically-supported- less rigorous than evidence-based practices are empirically-supported practices. To be empirically supported, a program must have been evaluated in some way and have demonstrated some relationship to a positive outcome. This may not meet the rigor of evidence-base, but still has some support for effectiveness.

Best-practices – best practices are often those widely accepted in the field as good practice. They may or may not have empirical support as to effectiveness, but are often derived from teams of experts in the field.

Definitions for Work Stages

Identifying and Assessing Needs – This phase is the earliest phase in the process, where you are identifying a need to be addressed. The assessing needs phase includes identifying the need, determining if there is available data demonstrating that this a problem, forming teams to address the issue.

Develop theory of change—This phase focuses on the theorizing the causes of a problem. In this phase you would identify what you think might be causing the problem and develop a “theory of change”. The theory of change is essentially how you think your activities (or intervention) will improve outcomes.

Develop/select solution—This phase includes developing or selecting a solution. In this phase, you might be exploring potential best-practices or evidence-based practices that you may want to implement as a solution to the identified need. You might also be developing a specific training, program, or practice that you want to implement.

Implementation – the implementation phase of work is when an intervention is being piloted or tested. This includes adapting programs or practices to meet your needs, and developing implementation supports.

Evaluation/assessment – the evaluation and assessment phase includes any efforts to collect data about the fidelity (process measures: was it implemented as planned?) or effectiveness (outcome measures: is the intervention making a difference?) of the project. The evaluation assessment phase also includes post-evaluation efforts to apply findings, such as making changes to the program/practice and using the data to inform next steps.